



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,568

01/14/2004

Michiaki Omura

P/1929-91

5922

2352 7590 10/29/2008  
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN  
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

KEEFER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2454

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/29/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/758,568	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OMURA, MICHIAKI	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL E. KEEFER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment and RCE filed 8/14/2008.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of McConnell et al. (US 2002/0015403), hereafter McConnell.

Regarding **claim 1**, AAPA discloses:

A gateway for connecting networks of different types, for connecting a first network and a second network which uses a signal format different from that of the first network, said gateway comprising:

a conversion section which converts a signal used in the first network to a signal to be used in the second network, and a signal used in the second network to a signal to be used in the first network, when communication is performed between a terminal connected to the first network and a terminal connected to the second network; (page 1, lines 26-33 discloses a gateway which converts signals between two networks)

a network connecting section which is connected to at least one of the first and second networks and which transmits the conversion-process information to

Art Unit: 2454

a fee-charging system of the first network or a fee-charging system of the second network. (page 1, lines 26-33 disclose that there is a network connecting section in a gateway)

AAPA discloses all of the limitations of claims 1 except for detecting conversion-information, and a fee-charging system.

McConnell teaches a gateway which includes a detecting system and billing interface to interact with billing servers. [0185] teaches the gathering of extensive billing data, including the amount of data downloaded (i.e. converted) and the amount of time taken for the download of content (i.e. the conversion of content). Various billing (fee-charging) systems are sent this information ([0187] teaches that the data can be presented to the operator's billing system.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine AAPA with the gateway system of McConnell in order to allow a range of services to be provided in a versatile manner.

Regarding **claim 2**, AAPA discloses:

wherein said conversion section converts at least one of a call-control signal generated by call-connection signaling, an audio signal generated by an audio CODEC and a video signal 25 generated by a video CODEC. (Page 2 lines 2-10 disclose a gateway converting control, audio and video signals)

Regarding **claim 3**, AAPA discloses:

wherein said conversion section comprises a signaling gateway unit which converts the call-control signal and a media gateway unit which converts the

Art Unit: 2454

audio signal and the video signal, wherein said detecting section detects the conversion-process information used in a conversion process in the media gateway unit. (Page 2 lines 2-10 disclose a gateway converting control, audio and video signals)

3. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of McConnell et al. (US 2002/0015403), hereafter McConnell.

Regarding **claim 5**, AAPA discloses:

A system for charging fees for communication between networks of different types, said system comprising:

a first terminal which performs a call control; (a first terminal is inherent in the communications described on page 2 lines 2-10.)

a second terminal which responds to the call control performed by the first terminal; (a second terminal is inherent in the communications described on page 2 lines 2-10.)

a first network to which the first terminal is connected; (Page 1 lines 13-25 discloses a first network)

a second network to which the second terminal is connected; and (Page 1 lines 13-25 discloses a second network)

a gateway which connects the first network and the second network, (page 1, lines 26-33 discloses a gateway which converts signals between two networks)

wherein:

the first network and the second network use different signal formats;

(Page 1 lines 13-25 discloses that the network use different signals)

the first network comprises a fee-charging system;

the gateway converts a signal from the first network to a suitable signal for the signal format of the second network and transmits the signal to the second network, converts a signal from the second network to a suitable signal for the signal format of the first network and transmits the signal to the first network, detects conversion-process information containing at least one of the time spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted, and (page 1, lines 26-33 discloses a gateway which converts signals between two networks)

transmits the conversion-process information to the fee-charging system, in order to accomplish communication between the first terminal and the second terminal; and the fee-charging system performs a fee-charging process in accordance with the conversion-process information, to charge a fee on a user of the first terminal.

AAPA discloses all of the limitations of claims 5-6 except for detecting conversion-information after two terminals are connected, and a fee-charging system.

McConnell teaches a gateway which includes a detecting system and billing interface to interact with billing servers. [0185] teaches the gathering of extensive billing data, including the amount of data downloaded (i.e. converted) and the amount of time taken for the download of content (i.e. the conversion of content). Various billing (fee-

Art Unit: 2454

charging) systems are sent this information ([0187] teaches that the data can be presented to the operator's billing system.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine AAPA with the gateway system of McConnell in order to allow a range of services to be provided in a versatile manner.

Regarding **claim 7**, AAPA discloses:

wherein the gateway detects the conversion-process information about at least one of a signal generated by an audio CODEC and a signal generated by a video CODEC. (converting audio and video signals is disclosed on page 2 lines 2-10.)

4. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of McConnell et al. (US 2002/0015403), hereafter McConnell.

Regarding **claim 8**, AAPA discloses:

A method of charging fees for communication between networks of different types, comprising the steps of: connecting a first network and a second network using a signal format different from that of the first network, by means of a gateway which converts a communication signal from a first terminal connected to the first network, to a suitable signal for the signal format of the second network and converts a communication signal from a second terminal connected to the second terminal, to a suitable signal for the signal format of the first network; detecting conversion-process information containing at least One of the

Art Unit: 2454

time spent to convert a signal and the amount of data converted, said signal having been transmitted after the first terminal and the second terminal have been connected to each other, by the gateway; transmitting the conversion-process information to a fee-charging system of the network to which the first or second terminal that is a calling side is connected, by the gateway; and charging a fee on a user of the calling-side terminal, said fee being fixed or calculated on the basis of communication 5 time, based on the conversion-process information, by the fee-charging system. (Page 1 lines 13-32 disclose the networks and the gateway, page 2 lines 2-10 disclose the conversion of audio, video and call signaling by the gateway)

AAPA discloses all of the limitations of claims 1-3 and 5-9 except for detecting conversion-information, and a fee-charging system.

McConnell teaches a gateway which includes a detecting system and billing interface to interact with billing servers. [0185] teaches the gathering of extensive billing data, including the amount of data downloaded (i.e. converted) and the amount of time taken for the download of content (i.e. the conversion of content). Various billing (fee-charging) systems are sent this information ([0187] teaches that the data can be presented to the operator's billing system.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine AAPA with the gateway system of McConnell in order to allow a range of services to be provided in a versatile manner.

Regarding **claim 9**, AAPA discloses:



wherein the conversion-process information includes at least one of the time spent to convert signals in an audio CODEC and video CODEC and the amount of data converted therein (Page 2 lines 2-10 disclose a gateway converting control, audio and video signals).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and McConnell as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Agrawal et al. (US 2001/0046234), hereafter Agrawal in further view of Jabri (US 2003/0027643).

AAPA and McConnell teach all the limitations of claim 4 except for the specific conversions of Q.931 to SIP, AMR to G.723.1, and MPEG4 to H.263.

The general concept of converting H.323 (which inherently includes Q.931 signalling) to SIP signaling is well known in the art as taught by Agrawal. (See abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify AAPA and McConnell with the general concept of converting H.323 (which inherently includes Q.931 signalling) to SIP signaling as taught by Agrawal in order to allow interworking function including a state machine for interworking between two dissimilar protocols.

AAPA, McConnell, and Agrawal teach all the limitations of claim 4 except for the specific conversions of AMR to G.723.1 and MPEG4 to H.263.

The general concept of converting AMR to G.723.1 and MPEG4 to H.263 is well known in the art as taught by Jabri. ([0014] lines 2-5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify AAPA, McConnell and Agrawal with the general concept of

Art Unit: 2454

converting AMR to G.723.1 and MPEG4 to H.263 as taught by Jabri in order to increase the versatility of the system.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicant argues that McConnell does not disclose or suggest detecting information that contains the time spent for converting a signal. The Examiner continues to disagree with this contention as stated in the advisory action and in the previous Final rejection. The claim does not require this information to be independent of any other type of time information, but that it is -contained- in the information. "information containing at least one of a time said conversion section spent to convert the first signal or the second signal..." The download time monitored by McConnell does contain any time required to convert the signals between the network. Additionally, the examiner notes that McConnell does keep track of the amount of data that is transferred (i.e. converted) which is also found in paragraph 185 of McConnell. (See rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-9 above).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

Art Unit: 2454

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 10/24/2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446